

To: Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA[]
Cc: Sheehan Bill [captain@hackensackriverkeeper.org]; cott Fallon [fallon@northjersey.com]; ill kleinman [jill.kleinman@gmail.com]
From: Gil HAWKINS
Sent: Mon 6/25/2012 5:43:52 PM
Subject: Re: Passaic/Quanta
gilhawkins@verizon.net
fallon@northjersey.com
captain@hackensackriverkeeper.org
jill.kleinman@gmail.com
[http://www.northjersey.com/news/160110915 Barges may haul out dioxin.html?c=y&page=2](http://www.northjersey.com/news/160110915_Barges_may_haul_out_dioxin.html?c=y&page=2)

Dear Walter,

Thank you for your quick and thorough explanation of the the differences in the Passaic River and Quanta/Edgewater sites. I am not as disappointed as much as concerned for the Quanta remedy and its potential ongoing impact on the Hudson River. I am encouraged that dredging is being considered for the in river site known as OU2. Due to the fact that much of the Borough of Edgewater is built on river sediment, I never considered OU1 as an "upland" site and my concern for future contamination for the river in the in situ remedy continues.

At the hearings, there were statements made by EPA officials that removal and destruction of the material on the Quanta site would be too difficult and costly, yet a few miles away that procedure is happening on the Passaic. I know that each site has different specifications and is treated differently, but the rational for leaving monoliths of contaminated concrete on the banks of the Hudson is loosing some of it validity.

Once again your response and explanation of the different sites is much appreciated.

Sincerely,
Gil

On Jun 25, 2012, at 10:14 AM, Walter Mugdan wrote:

Dear Gil,

I know that you are disappointed about the in situ stabilization remedy we selected for the contaminated upland soils at the Quanta/Edgewater site. We are satisfied that is an appropriate and protective remedy. We have not yet selected the remedy for the contaminated Hudson River sediments adjacent to the Quanta site; dredging those sediments is an option we are actively considering.

With respect to the Passaic River, I note that the contaminated soils at the upland Diamond Alkali facility (from which significant amounts of dioxin were discharged into the river) were capped in place. Tierra Solutions, one of the responsible parties, recently completed a removal action in which 40,000 cubic yards of the most heavily contaminated river sediments were dredged from an area immediately adjacent to the former Diamond Alkali facility. The administrative order described in the press report to which you refer in your email message requires dredging and capping of additional contaminated sediments several miles further upstream.

At the Hudson River PCB site, remnant deposits on the flood plains were capped in place, while a large volume of contaminated in-river sediments is now being dredged.

Upland contaminated soils and underwater contaminated sediments are often addressed differently.

Among other reasons, contamination in aquatic sediments can more easily enter the food chain, thus posing greater risks to humans and other animals. Even when capping is the selected remedy for aquatic contaminated sediments, a certain amount of dredging is often carried out in order to allow the cap to be installed without raising the elevation of the river bottom (which could increase flooding).

- Walter

From: Gil HAWKINS <gilhawkins@verizon.net>
To: Scott Fallon <fallon@northjersey.com>
Cc: Sheehan Bill <captain@hackensackriverkeeper.org>, Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, jill kleinman <jill.kleinman@gmail.com>
Date: 06/24/2012 12:50 PM
Subject: Passaic/Quanta

Scott, I had a hard time finding your story
<http://www.northjersey.com/news/160110915_Barges_may_haul_out_dioxin.html?c=y&page=2> on the Passaic R. cleanup on the web site, but did read it in the hard copy. Interesting that the EPA rejected removal (Barge or otherwise) from the Edgewater Honeywell Quanta site and is favoring barge removal from the Passaic River site. It seems to me that the in-situ solidification remedy in the Quanta ROD might be more suited to the Passaic site and removal would be better where the population density (Edgewater) and a National Heritage River are more at risk for future contamination. All the negative reasons for removal at Quanta are now compromised by the Passaic remediation proposals only a few miles away and on a more limiting waterway than the Hudson River.

Gil

<Mail Attachment.jpeg>

Gil Hawkins ~~~<^><...

Environmental Affairs

Hudson River Fishermen's Association

201-446-2652